

M



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/886,547	06/21/2001	Catherine G. Bala	FIS9-2000-0416	7268

29154 7590 07/09/2003

FREDERICK W. GIBB, III
MCGINN & GIBB, PLLC
2568-A RIVA ROAD
SUITE 304
ANNAPOLIS, MD 21401

EXAMINER

LEROUX, ETIENNE PIERRE

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2171

DATE MAILED: 07/09/2003

[Signature]

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/886,547

Applicant(s)

BALA ET AL.

Examiner

Etienne P LeRoux

Art Unit

2171

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 27 August 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-5, 8, 10-13, 16, 19-23 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Pat No 6,222,666 issued to Ireland et al (hereinafter Ireland '666) in view of US Pat No 5,802,514 issued to Huber (hereinafter Huber '514).

Regarding claims 1, 10, 11 and 19, Ireland '666 discloses:

creating a query form in said client workstation [Fig 2 and col 6, lines 39-59]

receiving a response to said query form [col 8, lines 32-35]

packaging said response to represent updated data [col 10, lines 36-43]

Regarding claim 1, Ireland '666 discloses the essential elements of the claimed invention as noted above except for a response in worksheet grid form. Huber '514 discloses a response in worksheet grid form [Fig 4]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ireland '666 to include a response in worksheet grid form as taught by Huber '514 for the purpose of providing a means to store data in tabular format [col 9, lines 54-67].

Regarding claims 2, 8, 16, 20 and 26, Ireland '666 discloses secure complex queries [Fig 2, 223]

Regarding claims 3 and 21, Ireland '666 discloses a snapshot from data in a database of said server [col 2, lines 35-40]

Regarding claims 4, 5, 12, 13, 22 and 23, Ireland '666 discloses editing results [col 8, lines 21-31]

3. Claims 6, 14 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Ireland '666 and Huber '514 as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Pub No US 2002/0152293 issued to Hahn et al (hereinafter Hahn '293).

Regarding claims 6, 14 and 24, the combination of Ireland '666 and Huber '514 discloses the essential elements of the claimed invention as noted above but does not disclose comparing two similarly structured tables. Hahn '293 discloses comparing two similarly structured tables [Fig 5E]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Ireland '666 and Huber '514 to include comparing similarly structured tables as taught by Hahn '293 for the purpose of identifying data which has been revised [paragraph 0079].

4. Claims 7, 9, 15, 17 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Ireland '666 and Huber '514 as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Pub No US 2003/0023609 issued to Della-Libera et al (hereinafter Della-Libera '609).

Regarding claims 7, 15 and 25, the combination of Ireland '666 and Huber '514 discloses the essential elements of the claimed invention as noted above but does not disclose cascaded

mass changes. Della-Libera '609 discloses cascaded mass changes [paragraph 0122]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Ireland '666 and Huber '514 to include cascaded mass changes as taught by Della-Libera for the purpose of merging and/or copying rows I related table [paragraph 0064].

Regarding claims 9 and 17, the combination of Ireland '666 and Huber '514 discloses the essential elements of the claimed invention except for automatically maintaining a current level of implementation. Della-Libera '609 discloses automatically maintaining a current level of implementation [paragraph 0063]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Ireland '666 and Huber '514 to include automatically maintaining a current level of implementation as taught by Della-Libera '609 for the purpose of maintaining the data in the database at the most recent available.

5. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Ireland '666 and Huber '514 and further in view of US Pat No 6,567,915 issued to Guthery (hereinafter Guthery '915).

Regarding claim 18, the combination of Ireland '666 and Huber '514 discloses the essential elements of the claimed invention as noted above except for partitioning the database into private and public databases. Guthery '915 discloses partitioning the database into private and public databases [col 6, lines 44-50]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Ireland '666 and Huber

Art Unit: 2171

'514 to include partitioning the database into private and public databases as taught by Guthery '915 for the purpose of dividing the database into confidential and non-confidential user information [col 6, lines 44-46] .

Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Ireland '666 and Huber '514 as applied to claim 19 above, and further in view of Pub No US 2002/0167543 issued to Smith et al (hereinafter Smith '543).

Regarding claim 27, the combination of Ireland '666 and Huber '514 discloses the essential elements of the claimed invention as noted above except for JAVA programming language. Smith '543 discloses JAVA programming language [paragraph 0040]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Ireland '666 and Huber '514 to include JAVA programming language as taught by Smith '543 for the purpose of providing a platform independent language [paragraph 0040].

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Etienne LeRoux whose telephone number is (703) 305-0620. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday – Friday from 8:00 AM to 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic, can be reached on (703) 308-1436.

Art Unit: 2171

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Etienne LeRoux

June 25, 2003 *ELR*

Frantz Coby
FRANTZ COBY
PRIMARY EXAMINER